

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office

May 12, 1999

LB 126, 267, 719

SENATOR LANDIS: I would like to withdraw...

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: It is withdrawn.

SENATOR LANDIS: ...and substitute.

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Landis would offer AM1738.
(Legislative Journal page 1983.)

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Senator Landis, to open on AM1738 to
LB 267.

SENATOR LANDIS: Thank you, Mr. Lieutenant Governor, members of
the Legislature.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Senator, before you begin, members, if we
could have your attention.

SENATOR LANDIS: Thank you, Mr. Lieutenant Governor. LB 267 in
its original green copy form returns power that this Legislature
had tried to give to municipalities back to the state because
ultimately that system was struck down as unconstitutional and
we need to redraft our laws and put them back into the
appropriate shape before that court case occurred. It
was...it's a wide-ranging bill with a lot of areas that it
covers but it was largely noncontroversial. It has become the
home of most of the controversy in the liquor area because of
the clash that's gone on all session long on a variety of
liquor-related issues. That clash started in LB 126 when the
body largely rejected a wide variety of the committee amendments
that the bill had at that time, leaving in it essentially the
provisions that I'm trying to adopt into LB 267. Then that bill
disappeared from the light of day. There was an attempt to
negotiate solutions. I made an offer to the portions of the
liquor lobby and the retail lobby that was declined. After
that, Senator Bourne has LB 719, a bill that is relatively
noncontroversial reported out but I have to say I interjected
myself in consent calendar and muddied the waters. The same
thing happened with respect to a request by Creighton for an
acknowledgement of one of their contracting bodies to be able to
secure a license so that they could sell liquor or use liquor at
fund-raising and at alumni occasions, and certainly not for